



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,436	02/05/2002	Ursula Markau	1803-332-999	3877
24341	7590	10/15/2003	EXAMINER	
Pennie & Edmonds, LLP 3300 Hillview Avenue Palo Alto, CA 94304			HUTSON, RICHARD G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	12
DATE MAILED: 10/15/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/072,436

Applicant(s)

MARKAU ET AL.

Examiner

Richard G Hutson

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24, 27 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 25, 26, 28-30 and 32-35 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants amendment of the specification, and cancellation of claims 1-23 and the addition of new claims 24-35, Paper No. 11, 8/5/2003, is acknowledged. Claims 24-35 are still at issue and are present for examination.

Applicants' arguments filed on 8/5/2003, Paper No. 11, have been fully considered and are deemed to be persuasive to overcome some of the rejections previously applied. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn.

Priority

Applicants submission of European Patent Application No. 97121151.1, filed December 2, 1997, is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants filing of information disclosure statement, Paper No. 8, 8/5/2003, is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

Claims 25, 26, 28-30, 32-35 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 25, 26, 28-30, 32-35 depend from rejected claim 24.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed toward non-statutory subject matter. In the absence of the hand of man, naturally occurring Insert and press F9~are considered non-statutory subject matter. *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 206 USPQ 193 (1980). This rejection may be overcome by amending the claims to contain wording such as "An isolated and purified DNA sequence ...".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 24, 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 24 (claims 27 and 31 dependent from) is indefinite in that it the recitation "encoding substantially SEQ ID NO: 11" is unclear and confusing. It is unclear as to the metes and bounds of what is encompassed by those DNAs "encoding substantially SEQ ID NO: 11". In applicants response to the previous office action, referring to such

Art Unit: 1652

terminology, applicants refer to their specification at page 8, lines 1 to 10, which states “In referring to a peptide chain as being comprised of a series of amino acids “substantially or effectively” in accordance with a list offering no alternatives within itself, we include within that reference any versions of the peptide chain bearing substitutions made to one or more amino acids in such a way that the overall structure and the overall function of the protein composed of that peptide chain is substantially the same as – or undetectably different to – that of the unsubstituted version. For example it is generally possible to exchange alanine and valine without greatly changing the properties of the protein, especially if the changed site or sites are at a position not critical to the morphology of the folded protein.”

Applicants above explanation of the term substantially does not clearly define applicants claimed genus, given that applicants are including in the use of the term, we include within that reference “any versions of the peptide chain bearing substitutions made to one or more amino acids in such a way that the overall structure and the overall function of the protein composed of that peptide chain is substantially the same as – or undetectably different to – that of the unsubstituted version.” What is applicants intent of the “overall structure and the overall function” of the protein composed of that peptide chain and when is the “overall structure and the overall function” substantially the same?

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 1652

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 24, 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 24, 27 and 31 are directed to all DNA sequences encoding substantially SEQ ID NO: 11 and vectors and host cells comprising said DNA sequence.

The specification, however, only provides a single representative species, a DNA encoding the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 11, encompassed by these claims. There is no disclosure of any particular structure to function/activity relationship in the single disclosed species. The specification also fails to describe additional representative species of these DNA sequences by any identifying structural characteristics or properties other than the sequence of SEQ ID NO: 11. Given this lack of additional representative species as encompassed by the claims, Applicants have failed to sufficiently describe the claimed invention, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms that a skilled artisan would recognize Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant is referred to the revised guidelines concerning compliance with the written description requirement of U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, published in the Official Gazette and also available at www.uspto.gov.

Claims 24, 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a DNA sequence encoding SEQ ID NO: 11, does not reasonably provide enablement for any DNA sequence encoding substantially SEQ ID NO: 11. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized in *In re Wands* (858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ 2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988)) as follows: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claim(s).

Claims 24, 27 and 31 are so broad as to encompass any DNA sequence encoding substantially SEQ ID NO: 11 and vectors and host cells comprising said DNA sequence. The scope of the claims is not commensurate with the enablement provided by the disclosure with regard to the extremely large number of DNA sequences encoding any modified DNA polymerase, broadly encompassed by the claims. The claims rejected under this section of U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, minimal structural limits on the claimed DNA sequences. Since the amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, predictability of which changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires

a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (i.e. expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the proteins' structure relates to its function. However, in this case the disclosure is limited to that DNA sequence encoding SEQ ID NO: 11.

While recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known, it is not routine in the art to screen for multiple substitutions or multiple modifications, as encompassed by the instant claims, and the positions within a protein's sequence where amino acid modifications can be made with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining the desired activity/utility are limited in any protein and the result of such modifications is unpredictable. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, e.g. multiple substitutions.

The specification does not support the broad scope of the claims which encompass all modifications and fragments of any DNA sequence encoding SEQ ID NO: 11, because the specification does not establish: (A) regions of the protein structure which may be modified without effecting polymerase, reverse transcriptase, 5'-3' exonuclease and RNase H activity; (B) the general tolerance of such modified DNA polymerases to modification and extent of such tolerance; (C) a rational and predictable scheme for modifying any amino acid residue of SEQ ID NO: 11 with an expectation of obtaining the desired biological function; and (D) the specification provides insufficient guidance as to which of the essentially infinite possible choices is

Art Unit: 1652

likely to be successful. Because of this lack of guidance, the extended experimentation that would be required to determine which substitutions would be acceptable to retain the activities claimed and the fact that the relationship between the sequence of a peptide and its tertiary structure (i.e. its activity) are not well understood and are not predictable (e.g., see Ngo et al. in *The Protein Folding Problem and Tertiary Structure Prediction*, 1994, Merz et al. (ed.), Birkhauser, Boston, MA, pp. 433 and 492-495, Ref: U, Form-892), it would require undue experimentation for one skilled in the art to arrive at the majority of those DNA sequences of the claimed genus encoding DNA polymerases with the claimed activities.

Thus, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner reasonably correlated with the scope of the claims broadly including any DNA sequence which encodes substantially SEQ ID NO: 11. The scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation with the scope of enablement (*In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 19 24 (CCPA 1970)). Without sufficient guidance, determination of having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue. See *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard G Hutson whose telephone number is (703) 308-0066. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am to 4:00 pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on (703) 308-3804. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard G. Hutson', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Richard G Hutson, Ph.D.

Application/Control Number: 10/072,436
Art Unit: 1652

Page 10

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1652

rg
10/15/2003